



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,310	12/17/1999	ROBERT J. CHANSLER	07844-280001	2224

21876 7590 12/29/2003
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
500 ARGUELLO STREET
SUITE 500
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/467,310

Applicant(s)

CHANSLER, ROBERT J.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 10/08/2003.
2. Claims 1-35 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 32 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, claims 1, 4-8, 11, 20, 21, 24-28, 31, and 32 are amended. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rangarajan et al ("Rangarajan", US 6,275,225).

As per independent claim 1, Rangarajan teaches a method of defining a user interface for a computer program, comprising:

after execution of the computer program has begun (*Start 201* of fig. 2; col. 5, line 8),
defining a user interface of the program (col. 5, lines 56-58) by:

reading a function description of a first function to be provided by the user interface (col. 7, lines 8-14, and 605 and 607 of fig. 6), the function description including logic for selecting an appearance of the user interface (col. 7, lines 45-61; e.g. *Topology View, Pie/Bar*);

Art Unit: 2174

reading an appearance description of a first appearance to be presented by the user interface (col. 7, lines 30-61);

associating the function description and the appearance description on the fly at run time; and executing the user interface with the associated function and appearance (215 of fig. 2).

As per claims 2, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system to replace the function description during program execution.

As per claims 3, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system to replace the appearance description during program execution.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Rangarajan teaches:

reading a map defining multiple functions to be provided by the user interface including the first function (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-27);

reading a fashion defining all appearances to be presented by the user interface including the first appearance (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34);

associating the map and the fashion on the fly at run time; and executing the user interface with the associated map and fashion (col. 9, lines 49-52).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system to replace the map during program execution.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system to replace the fashion during program execution.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 4, Rangarajan teaches the map specifies that a subordinate part of the user interface is specified by a second map-fashion pair (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-27).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 4, Rangarajan teaches receiving events from one of the map and the fashion (col. 8, lines 27-29).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Rangarajan teaches comprising executing business logic associated with the respective component (col. 8, lines 29-33).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Rangarajan's system that the components are stored in a database.

As per independent claim 11, Rangarajan teaches a method of defining a user interface for a computer program, comprising:

associating a map component and a fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-34 and col. 9, lines 49-52), the map component including logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component (col. 9, line

Art Unit: 2174

59 – col. 10, line 13); and executing the user interface with the associated function and appearance (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-34 and col. 9, lines 49-52).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Rangarajan teaches loading a resource bundle associated with the map component (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-27).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Rangarajan teaches locating sub-components of the user interface (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Rangarajan teaches further comprising instantiating one or more sub components of the user interface (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, Rangarajan teaches calling the fashion component to allocate a resource to each sub-component (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 28-34).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Rangarajan teaches instructing each sub-component to present itself in the user-interface (col. 9, lines 49-52 and fig. 9; col. 9, lines 59-67 through col. 10, lines 1-13).

As per claims 17 and 18, which are all dependent on claim 11, they are rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 11, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

As per independent claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 10; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per independent claims 31 and 32, they are similar in scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar scope.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 32, Rangarajan teaches the device is a display (*III* of fig. 1).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 32, it is inherent in Rangarajan's computer system (fig. 1) to have a sound input-output device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangarajan.

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 32, Rangarajan does not disclose the device is a telephone. The Examiner take Official Notice that a telephone connects to a PC system and utilizes the PC monitor to present a user interface associated with the telephone is well known in computer art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include a telephone device in Rangarajan's system since it would give a user an extra option, which is the voice option, to present the user interface.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/08/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

Art Unit: 2174

(a) Rangajaran does not disclose or suggest “reading a function description of a first function to be provided the user interface, the function description including logic for selecting an appearance of the user interface.”

(b) Rangajaran does not disclose or suggest “associating a map component and a fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface, the map component including logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component.”

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

(a) Rangajaran does teach reading a function description of a first function to be provided the user interface (col. 7, lines 8-14, and 605 and 607 of fig. 6), the function description including logic for selecting an appearance of the user interface (col. 7, lines 45-61; e.g. *Topology View, Pie/Bar*).

(b) Rangajaran does teach associating a map component and a fashion component on the fly at run time to generate the user interface (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 22-34 and col. 9, lines 49-52), the map component including logic for changing one of the map component and the fashion component (col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 13).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2174

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
December 18, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100